(ii) it passes through Nathamedu village which fact is not desirable for routing of a National Highway;

(iii) the width of poramboke lands available is only about 35 feet to 40 feet and that too only for about ¼ length of the approach road, still necessitating the acquisition of wet lands to conform to the National Highway Standards.

The alternative alignment suggested by the petitioners along the manavari lands to the South of the Alingal channel is also not found suitable by the Chief Engineer (Highways) as this also involves acquisition of patta lands, besides presenting a series of awkward curves near the existing bridge over Alingal channel.

He has, however, reported that, after taking into consideration the representations of the villagers and also incorporating the requisite geometric standards for a National Highway, he has shifted the site for the bridge to 40 feet down-stream of the original site and has also slightly changed the alignment for the approach road. The irrigation wells will not be affected under the revised alignment proposed for the approach road. It will, however, involve acquisition of some wet lands which is considered inevitable. The alignment now chosen for the approach road is the best possible under the circumstances. The Consulting Engineer (Road Development), Government of India, has also approved of the revised alignment.

III.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. SPEAKER.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to announce to the House that I have received the following message from the Governor of Madras, dated 20th March 1956:—

"The Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Re-enacting Bill, 1956, was passed by both the Houses of the State Legislature and was reserved by me under Article 200 of the Constitution for the consideration of the President. The President has, in pursuance of the proviso to Article 201 of the Constitution, directed that the Bill be returned to the Houses of the State Legislature with a message requesting that they will reconsider clause 3 of the Bill and in particular, consider the desirability of revising that clause on the following lines:—

'3. *Savings.*—Anything done or any action taken (including any rule or order made, notification issued, decision, award or direction given, proceeding taken, liability or penalty incurred and punishment awarded) under the provisions of the said Act—

(*a*) as in force immediately before its expiry; or

21st March 1956] [Mr. Speaker]

(*b*) on or after the 26th day of January 1956, and before the date of publication of this Act in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, on the footing that the said Act was in force at the relevant time,

shall be deemed to have been done or taken under the corresponding provision of this Act :

Provided that nothing contained in this section shall render any person liable to any punishment whatsoever by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by him contrary to the provisions of the said Act on or after the 26th day of January 1956, and before the date of publication of this Act in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.'

"In accordance with the above direction, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby return the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Re-enacting Bill, 1956, to the Houses of the Legislature for reconsidering clause 3 of the Bill and in particular to consider whether that clause may be revised on the lines indicated in the direction of the President subject to the alteration of the words 'corresponding provision of this Act' occurring in the said clause into "corresponding provisions of the said Act as hereby re-enacted.""

Hon. Members will remember that yesterday the hon. Member from Tiruvallur—Reserved Constituency said that a number of his questions remained unanswered, although answers have been received from the departments. I have since verified and I find that 185 questions were received from the Member of which 140 questions were admitted, 18 were disallowed and 27 were referred back to the member for further clarification. Of the 140 questions admitted, 85 questions have already been answered and 35 are pending with the Departments of the Secretariat. Answers have been received for 20 unstarred questions which will be included in the list of unstarred questions on 22nd March 1956 and in another subsequent list. There is therefore no starred question of the Member pending in the office

I want to take this opportunity of telling the Members that we should establish a convention of not putting any questions relating to the Legislature Secretariat on the floor of the House, because, Hon. Members must remember that any information which any hon. Member desires to have is readily available to him from the Secretariat through the Speaker. Another embarrassment which is caused is, questions relating to the Legislature Secretariat will have to be answered by the Speaker and necssarily supplementary questions may also have to be asked and nowhere there is the practice obtaining in any parliamentary institution for the Speaker to be answering questions and supplementary questions. And, I may tell the hon. Members that there is no information which the Speaker has which cannot be made available to any hon. Member through him from the Secretariat. He is not also in a position like that of a Minister; it is open to a Minister to withhold certain information from the House on the ground that it is not in public interests to divulge that information at a particular moment or subsequently. So far as the Speaker is concerned, he has no 10-10 a.m.

[Mr. Speaker] [21st March 1956

further information than what is available to any hon. Member. Therefore, as a matter of convention, I would request that no questions regarding the Legislature Secretariat should be raised on the floor of the House.

Another matter also I should like to mention and that is no question relating to any Presiding Officer should, as a matter of convention, be raised in the House. I am stating this because a question was asked some time back regarding the Presiding Officer. I examined the matter and I had also the opportunity of placing my views before the late Speaker of the Lok Sabha and other Speakers at the Speakers' Conference and it has been almost the unanimous opinion that no questions regarding Presiding Officers also should be raised on the floor of the House. Therefore, I request that if any hon. Member desires to have any information regarding questions or anything pertaining to the Legislature Secretariat, that will be made readily available to him by the office or through the Speaker.

Mr. Balakrishnan wanted certain changes to be introduced in the procedure regarding questions. There is at present a Register called "Progress Report of Questions" maintained in the office which contains several headings regarding the name of the questioner and subject, the department concerned, whether it is admitted or disallowed and the dates relating to the subsequent progress of the questions. If the hon. Member wants any deviation from the existing procedure, it can be discussed in the appropriate Committee of the House. I shall therefore place his letter also before the appropriate Committee and he will have an opportunity of discussing the procedure to be followed. We can lay down any procedure that we like that ought to be followed.

IV.—VOTING ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1956–57—*cont.*

(1) DEMAND XVI—MEDICAL,

(2) DEMAND XVII—PUBLIC HEALTH,

(3) DEMAND XXXVII—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON PUBLIC HEALTH.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor, I move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,73,32,000 under Demand No. XVI—Medical; a sum not exceeding Rs. 89,51,400 under Demand No. XVII—Public Health; and a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,94,13,200 under Demand No. XXXVII—Capital Outlay on Public Health.

With the permission of the Chair, I request my Colleague the Minister for Religious Endowments to read the statement which I wish to present to the House.

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : *Second Five-Year Plan.*—The Second Five-Year Plan provides for the following medical schemes which may be considered to be important :—

(1) Increase of bed-strength in Government hospitals by 43 per cent over the existing bed-strength of 13,856: